

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/767,126 01/28/2004 HERMAN04-01 Bob Herman 4296 EXAMINER 7590 11/26/2004 Anderson & Morishita, L.L.C. COBURN, CORBETT B Suite 102 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2725 S. Jones Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89146 3714

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/767,126	HERMAN, BOB	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Corbett B. Coburn	3714	
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
THE - External control	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION PRIOR TO STATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION PRIOR TO SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a compared period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory periure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the managed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- reply within the statutory minimum of thirt- iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB.	eply be timely filed ((30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communicati ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	on.
Status				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28	3 January 2004.		
2a)□	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	his action is non-final.		
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allow		ers, prosecution as to the ments	is
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims			
4) 🖂	Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
5) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) 🗌	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		
Applicat	ion Papers			
9)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.		
10)🛛	The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2004 is/a	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ ol	ejected to by the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to t	he drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11)□	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr The oath or declaration is objected to by the	, =-	•	(d).
·	•	*	. ,	-
_	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents		119(a)-(d) or (f).	
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in A	oplication No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	riority documents have been	received in this National Stage	
	application from the International Bur	, , , ,		
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a l	list of the certified copies not	received.	
Attach	·*/c)			
Attachmer 1) 🔯 Notic	ιτ(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)	
2) 🔲 Notic	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date	
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ er No(s)/Mail Date	08) 5)	formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Sports Betting Pool With Tie-Breaker.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
 - (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1 & 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motorsport F1 Pick 6 (http://www.motorsport.com/compete/p6/rules.asp) in view of Tsatskin (US Patent Number 4,842,275).
 - Claim 1: F1 Pick 6 describes a contest with a plurality of participants. The outcome of the contest is determined by a competitive event in which a finite set of competitors compete. Each competitor's performance generates at least one statistic during the competition event including those who do not win the competition. Each participant selects a subset of predetermined size (6) from the list of competitors. At a predetermined point during the sporting event, an index is computed for each participant by summing the statistics associated with each competitor in each participant's subset,

Art Unit: 3714

without regard to the relationship of the competitors in the participant's subset.

Participants are ranked according to the calculated index.

F1 Pick 6 does not, however, have a tie-breaker feature. Tsatskin, another invention relating to sports contests, uses the statistics generated by the competitor's performance to rank the participants in the case of a tie. (Col 5, 4-21) Tie-breakers are well known in the art. Tie-breakers often allow a single winner to be declared instead of joint winners. This lends excitement to the game. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have ranked tied participants based on the statistics of the differentiating selections in order to be able to announce a single winner, thus increasing the excitement of the game.

Claim 2: F1 Pick 6 discloses that the participant ranks the competitors in the participant's subset and that participant's score is based on these rankings. F1 Pick 6 does not teach tie-breaking. Tsatskin teaches serially comparing statistics in order to break ties. (Col 5, 4-21) Tie-breakers are well known in the art. Tie-breakers often allow a single winner to be declared instead of joint winners. This lends excitement to the game. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have ranked tied participants by serially comparing rankings and, if a selection differentiates the tied participants, ranking the tied participants according to the statistics of the differentiating selections in order to be able to announce a single winner, thus increasing the excitement of the game.

Application/Control Number: 10/767,126

Art Unit: 3714

4. Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motorsport F1 Pick 6 and Tsatskin as applied to claim 1 or 5 above, and further in view of Scarne (Scarne's New Complete Guide to Gambling, 1961, pages 160-162).

Page 4

Claims 3 & 5: Motorsport F1 Pick 6 and Tsatskin teach the invention substantially as claimed. They do not, however, teach wagering. Scarne teaches that wagering on sporting events is well known. Many people believe that wagering on an event makes that event more exciting. Scarne also teaches giving an award to a predetermined number of participants. (Page 160) This ensures that the prize can be large enough to entice participants to play. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have each participant place a wager and reward a predetermined number of participants by order in order to increase the excitement of the game and to ensure that the prize can be large enough to entice participants to play.

Claims 4 & 6: Scarne teaches a baseball pool in which wagers were pooled and the reward was a predetermined portion of the pool.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pearson et al. (US Patent Number 5,971,854) teaches aggregating statistics to determine a winner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corbett B. Coburn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4447. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30, Monday-Friday, alternate Fridays off.

Application/Control Number: 10/767,126

Art Unit: 3714

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on (571) 272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Corbett B. Coburn

Page 5

Examiner

Art Unit 3714